# MARY WASHINGTON COLLEGE BULLETIN

QUARTERLY REVIEW SUMMER 1970

Quarterly Review

Vol. 1, No. 8, Summer, 1970

MARY WASHINGTON COLLEGE

OF THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION

*President*
Ruby York Weinbrecht '48
*First vice president—Fund*
Ellen Duschock '64
*Second vice president—Homecoming*
Isabel Gordon '42
*Third vice president—Alumnae Council*
Olivia Wheeler McCallum '36

BOARD OF DIRECTORS
Irene Lundy Brown '39
Lucy Houston Christian '26
Ellen Duschock '64
Sally Monroe Fox '68
Myrtle Lee Dean France '62
Judith Townsend Gatlin '58
Carol Pridgen Gill '57
Isabel Gordon '42
Bette Worsham Hawkins '48
Donna Henniger Henderson '61
Mary I. Hickle '66
Susan Rutan Joehnk '63
Kathy Friedman Levinson '63
Olivia Wheeler McCallum '36
Joanne Insley Pearre '57
Chancellor Grellet C. Simpson
Sally Kay Souder '66
Mary Ellen Stephenson
Patricia Ives Stoner '71
Ruby York Weinbrecht '48
Sarah Armstrong Worman '48

LIAISON FOR ALUMNAE AFFAIRS
Michael Houston
*Assistant to the Chancellor*

ALUMNAE OFFICE STAFF
*Director of Alumnae Affairs*
Ann Perinchief '67
*General Secretary*
Joy Simpson Toombs
*Records Clerk*
Carolyn McWhirt Whitaker

EDITOR
Thomas P. Mann
Box 1315, College Station
Fredericksburg 22401

MEMBER OF AMERICAN ALUMNI COUNCIL

Mary Washington College Bulletin, *Quarterly Review* Issue, Volume 1, Number 8 July 1970. Published monthly except August and November by Mary Washington College, Fredericksburg, Virginia, 22401. Second Class Postage Paid at the Post Office, Fredericksburg, Virginia.

**CONTENTS**

MWC Revisited
an alumna looks at the student today ..... 3

Into the '70's
a climate for change ..... 9

Spotswood Spotlight ..... 14

## CHANGE!

In preparing and printing a quarterly review of a liberal arts college such as Mary Washington, the Editor consistently finds one word appearing again and again in almost every article on nearly every subject. This word is change! In this issue we will consider the changes that have occurred in two of the major components which make up Mary Washington College—the students and the academic programs.

The students today are a topic of wide discussion. They are the subject of many questions, but few answers. In an effort to identify "the student today at MWC" in terms understood by the student of yesterday, we called upon one from among you to return to the campus and get a first hand look at her successor. Mrs. **Rose Bennett** Gilbert '60, a practicing journalist and writer, spent a day at the College looking and asking all of the unanswered questions of students, administrators and faculty members. Her observations, which she presented in capsule form at Homecoming this year, are featured in the first article in this issue of the Quarterly Review.

Significant changes in the academic program at MWC have been occurring at a fairly consistent pace throughout most of the 1960's. The 1969-70 school session, however, will possibly be recorded as a highwater-mark in the wave of changes that are sweeping over not only MWC, but also higher education throughout the nation. The changes that have occurred this year were not hastily enacted, but arrived at only through thorough deliberation. Spearheading this process was the ad hoc Committee on Degree Requirements, the Calendar Year and the Student Course Load. Donald E. Glover, Associate Professor and Chairman of the Department of English, author of the second feature article in this issue, served as secretary of this committee and is well qualified to detail the background and nature of the changes which have been approved to date by the faculty.

*Photos by Thomas Mann and Taketo Ohtani*

# MWC Revisited

## an alumna looks at the student today

by Rose Bennett Gilbert

Her skirts are shorter, her hair is longer and her world is wider.

She still sunbathes on the Tri-Unit ramps and complains about the dining hall food. She still flops across her dormitory bed after classes to study or talk or play an occasional hand of bridge.

But there probably aren't any curlers in her cornsilk hair . . . there could be a drink in her hand if she's playing with the girls . . . or at other times her boyfriend might be her bridge partner.

Bob Dylan has written the theme song of the day. Its chorus goes, "The times they are a-changin'," and it's the perfect music to read this *Report on the MWC Student Today* by.

The times have changed indeed at Mary Washington College during the 10 years since I graduated. The Tumultuous Ten Years! From the Age of Assent to the Age of Aquarius in one ragged, rough-and-tumble decade! Why the changes? Whence their impetus? What effects on the gentle, genteel college I've carried around in my memory since that rainy graduation day in 1960 when we wept real, warm tears over all we were leaving?

Enthusiastically, I jumped on the invitation to come see for myself, to spend a whole April day sniffing out some answers, trying to decide what makes 1970's students tick . . . and sometimes explode. I came armed with notebooks, tape recorder and a very clear recollection of the way things *were,* of the days when "activists" were the girls who'd yell "Campus Cutter!" out the window when someone strode across Ball Circle. Our idea of a "confrontation" was stealing the Devil flag and lying in wait when they came to reclaim it. And the demands we made on the administration were for peanut butter and jelly on every dining hall table and the right to linger after dinner for coffee and cigarettes in Seacobeck.

As students, we were, in short, students . . . at least from Sunday night to Saturday noon. Our involvement with the outside world ended when our dates turned in their guest cards. For us, Mary Washington was truly an Ivory Tower from which waved a banner that said, "The Silent Generation Lives Here."

But we lived here happily. We had fun, in the foolish ways college girls

*Rose Bennett Gilbert '60 is currently a contributing editor of 1001 Decorating Ideas, a magazine on home decoration published by the Conso Publishing Company in New York City. In addition to writing articles for this periodical she has authored several books for the same publisher. She has previously worked as a reporter and feature writer for The Richmond News Leader; as an assistant editor for Museum News, printed by the American Association of Museums; and as a reporter for the Bethlehem Globe-Times in Bethlehem, Pa.*

have fun, with short-sheets and bull sessions, surprise sister class serenades and class benefit shows that must have launched the whole off-Broadway anti-theatre movement! We had fun in more serious ways, too. We marched on Washington—to tour the National Gallery. And we got high—on Eliott's poetry and Ingmar Berman's elusive movies. When we got drunk, it was with new-found knowledge and classroom discoveries.

I use those images deliberately, because we did not drink at all within the 25-mile radius. Grass was what you kept off enroute to class, and the only drugs we had any experience with were two-toned panacea pills from the infirmary. Those pills seemed to cure everything, except our common case of myopia. We could see the books at the end of our nose, and we gazed with fascination into the arts and sciences of the past. But when we looked out into the "real world," we saw only our own rosy futures in graduate school, in careers, in marriage and motherhood. Somehow we looked past all the problems. They were out there, of course, but they didn't affect us. We didn't feel poverty, civil wrongs didn't reach us, and the Asian war was still something we saw occasionally in foreign newsreels at the movies . . . they were still running newsclips in the movies in those days. Television was a sometimes thing, to be watched on Academy Awards night when we all gathered around one set in the dorm parlor. The rest of the time we avoided TV because it stole our study hours. Our news came in five-minute feedings on the radio, seldom through the daily papers (who had time to read them?). We never *saw* the face of the poor in our own living rooms, never watched soldiers our age being shot up in living color, never sat in on a sit-in or demonstration.

Demonstrations in our day were phenomena, confined to the Southern hinterlands, to causes we understood but didn't undertake. All around us, the country was fairly content with itself. We had won two wars and solved another in Korea. God had blessed America with invincibility. The rest of the world was learning to wear our kind of clothes, adopt our manners, speak our language.

"Throughout the Fifties we lived in a dream," says Henry D. Aiken, professor of philosophy at Brandeis University.

"The sleepy Eisenhower years," writer Frank Conroy calls them in an analysis of his generation (my generation) for *Esquire* magazine. "America in a trance, drifting leisurely through a long golf game while the clouds gathered."

It would be six months after our graduation before a young idealist named Kennedy was elected President, eight months before he would admonish us not to ask what we could get from our country, but to give instead, to sacrifice, to do for it. And I think we may all have been a bit

surprised at his suggestion that improvements could, should be made in our way of life.

If that sounds naive, it's because we were. We accepted; today's students except. Perhaps Kennedy did awaken the social and political senses of the young. Perhaps his idealism magnified theirs. Perhaps his death shattered all that in full-stride — today's seniors were just turning teenagers when he was killed. Or perhaps he was only part of the beginning, just one of the forces of change. There was another Kennedy, a Martin Luther King, a war in which the young could not believe.

Far wiser people than I have pondered the whys behind the rapid swing from acquiescence to activism among college students. Worried parents, puzzled sociologists, sympathetic psychiatrists with 12-year-old drug addicts on their couches have pondered the question. So have college presidents and deans, often as their institutions tumbled around them, literally. The kids themselves can't put their fingers on the causes, although they point vaguely to the threat of nuclear cataclysm and poisoned air, to hypocrisy and bigotry at home, to unjust wars abroad . . . to computers and television and The Pill . . . and all the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune that tender young flesh is heir to today.

Flash back to Bob Dylan and his theme song. Pick up my imaginary scenario in the dorm with the bridge-playing group. Only leave out the cards, for cards are a frivolous pastime, and this is a generation with no time to pass away lightly. Through their dormitory window, beyond the manicured campus and outside the gates with their cliche covering of ivy, this generation sees the clouds that gathered during our "long golf game." Mushroom-shaped clouds, clouds of polluted air, clouds of crowds that threaten to overflow the earth. They see a gathering storm of hate, of racism, of civil unrest. And they aren't sure there are any silver linings to be found.

Today's students—to use all the *au courant* words—are aware, they are involved, they are committed to change. For them, a college education is no longer four years spent studying the history of mankind, reverently fixed in amber and enshrined in an Ivory Tower. For them, past history is a curio to be examined, sometimes with admiration, often with amusement, then put back under glass when it's time to face the world out there today.

This generation has little reverence —and even less patience—for the past. The past, they say, spawned the troubles of today, and it holds no clues to their solution. So today's student has hauled that "Silent Generation" banner down off the Ivory Tower. Then she's pulled down the Ivory Tower itself, all but a few foundation stones. The banner she waves today reads, "Relevancy!" Underneath, it says, "Change is Good," and beneath that is a blank line so everyone can write in her own thing.

May Day circa 1969-70 offers a neat little summary of the way the Mary Washington student thinks today. For some 57 years we danced around a May pole, re-enacting the ancient—and pagan—Rite of Spring. We crowned our prettiest classmates, marched and curtsyed in time to taped music, then put on white gloves and crinolines to have a ball, literally, in honor of the May court. Secretly, we must have thought it all rather quaint, to say the least. But *we* never thought of overthrowing the Queen of the May.

*They* thought of it, and did it. May Day is now a Spring Festival. It features a street dance in front of Ann Carter Lee, a fun-and-games fair in Ball Circle and a rock concert by a group called the Brooklyn Bridge.

Proceeds went to Biafra last year; this year they are being used to establish an MWC scholarship for an American Indian.

In short, today's student has made May Day *relevant,* relevant to the outside world, to its pace and its problems. That word, relevance, comes up again and again when you talk with faculty members, the administration, the students themselves.

Sometimes it's a complimentary word.

Professor after professor speaks—with obvious delight—of the new responsiveness they find in the classroom today.

"Students are much better informed," says George Van Sant, chairman of the Philosophy Department. "Ten or 12 years ago I had to contend with a real ignorance of the world in general."

Larry Wishner, who heads the Chemistry Department, remembers, "I wouldn't have dreamed of giving lectures on water pollution nine years ago. Now my classes demand it."

Agrees Don Glover, new chairman of the English Department, "The options open to instructors, the levels on which they can teach, have expanded vastly in the past 10 years. More and more, students are willing to speak up, to feel that their opinions will be respected."

And they are. Faculty members today regard the student in a new light, a cross between respectful awe at one end of the scale and comradeship at the other. There's little left of the pontification we sometimes encountered in the classroom, the attempt "to cover academic ineffectiveness with authoritarianism and intimidation," as Glen Thomas of the new (to me) American Studies major puts it.

That was the stuff my generation made affectionate myths of," I ventured. "We accepted it almost as a natural part of the profession."

"You sure did!" shot back Mr. Van Sant. "This group won't."

Not only don't they accept it, they reject it publicly, in print, for all the campus to read. YET, student-compiled and financed, is a tough little publication that grades every professor on campus on his deskside manner, his willingness for class discussion, etc. In essence, it tells the girls what their Big Sisters used to . . . "Avoid her, take him." The administration argues that YET is just as biased and unfair as Big Sisters ever were, but the students call it "invaluable" and have made it a bestseller.

That may seem to imply open hostilities between the teachers and the taught. Just the opposite is the case, as Mr. Glover views the trend during his nine years at the college.

"Students have demanded more faculty-student contact of both the academic and social sort," he says. "There's far more entertaining at home, both by the faculty and by students who live off-campus . . . far more dropping-in just to chat."

Which brings us back to today's trend toward "relevancy," not an unmixed blessing.

"Students want to explore through personal relationships, contacts with the faculty," observes Mr. Thomas. "They want to make things relevant to the point where it's constricting. There's a movement away from the analytical, a desire for sensory immediateness." He sums it up rather neatly: "To feel is valid, to think is boring."

Chancellor Simpson sees the same tendency: "Today's students shy away from the intellectual life as being Ivory Tower."

Other faculty members may feel the trend less strongly, but they do agree that today's student is less willing to research the past, more eager to work in the present-day world, to pass up traditional research methods in favor of work in the field—to survey Fredericksburg housing conditions, for example, or study the *living* theatre . . . it's down with Eugene O'Neill, up with LeRoi Jones.

This is no phenomenon isolated on the MWC campus, of course. Earlier this year, *Mademoiselle* magazine surveyed a number of American colleges and reported:

> Those "teachable," docile, unquestioning college women of the past have all but vanished in the recent influx of critical, aggressive, innovative women, filled with a thirst and a reverence for social and personal relevance . . . Topical courses deal-

ing with the here and now . . . are seducing students away from the classic academic disciplines. For many students, the promise of immediate relevance in human contact, political activism, and self-expression in artwork, poetry, and dance are more enticing than formal subject matter and strictly cerebral courses."

It's in this business of relevancy that the great gap lies between past and present generations of MWC students. Today's undergraduate not only knows what's going on in the outside world, she's involved in it. And that means tutoring disadvantaged children as well as picketing the First Lady. It means picking up trash on Earth Day as well as marching on Washington.

I point this out because I believe that the great majority of MWC students is still made up of the kind of people we alumnae can identify with: law-abiding, hard-working, even fun-loving to some extent. As always, this Silent Majority (heinous phrase) has been pretty well obscured by the Vocal Minority who have made sometimes startling headlines as they strive to make things "relevant." Bad news has always been big news in the press.

The really radical students are very much in the minority, as one self-confessed radical told me herself. And she added, "Compare us with SDSers and Weathermen at other schools and we come out looking like conservatives."

This is not to say that the middle-of-the-road majority carries on business as usual—at least not as was usual when I was here. The students tell me that other colleges, both in and beyond Virginia, look on Mary Washington as a radical school. And they tell me that with a certain amount of pride.

Some of the changes they've effected will look radical, indeed, to alumnae eyes still visualizing the days when we lived by a fat little handbook crammed cover-to-cover with Thou-Shalt-Nots. Seen with the 20/20 vision of hindsight, it's obvious now that we, too, could have thinned that handbook down considerably. We just didn't ask, Chancellor Simpson reminded me with a grin, then went on to illustrate:

"I hadn't been at the college long when ———— (woman professor) stormed into my office without even knocking and demanded, 'Who says I can't smoke a cigarette in the C Shoppe?'

"I don't know who says," Dr. Simpson replied. "Go back and have your cigarette."

" 'But,' she managed, 'I don't smoke!' "

Now it's the students who want to know the "why not" behind regulations. And if there's no legitimate "why," there's no longer a regulation, in most cases.

Retiring Dean Reginald Whidden cites Chancellor Simpson as "extremely adept in anticipating some of the student demands. He's yielded to some and resisted others."

Chancellor Simpson himself feels, "I've had to do a lot of 'No' saying." But there have been no confrontations, no violence, no office-storming. The changes have come, sometimes in heated debate, sometimes through compromise, but always with equipoise.

To quickly survey some of those changes:

- Students can drink in their rooms. Before I sat down to tuna sandwiches and potato chips with the girls in Ann Fairfax Annex, we enjoyed a very welcome—and legal—bloody Mary. But except for such special occasions, most of the girls tend to shrug off the drinking subject quite casually: "Who has the time or the money?" And they tell me a special committee set up to handle "drinking problems" has been disbanded. They didn't have anything to do.
- Girls can wear pants wherever they please, except in administrative offices. I sat in on a class and found my dress way out of style—jeans, sandals and clogs seem to be the new classroom couture.
- Students with parental consent can live off-campus in their own apartments. Girls on campus can entertain men in their dormitory rooms during certain hours.
- Coming-in hours are the same for everyone: 12 during the week, 2 on weekends.
- A late, continental breakfast is now available at Seacobeck from 8 to 10 in the morning.
- There are no classes on Saturday and none on Wednesday afternoons. The number of cuts in their other classes is left to the students and their instructors to decide.
- When a girl goes away overnight, she leaves a note telling where she can be reached in an envelope to be opened only in an emergency.
- Dormitories are now integrated —both with some black students and with all classes (except for freshmen halls). Many of the dorms are looked after by paid student assistants, not head residents.
- Student Government has been overhauled completely—it's now the Student Association to imply, as its president pointed out, exactly that, an association of all the students, not just the elected few. Its power has also been spread out over a number of new branches.
- The Honor System has a new look, too. Dismissal is no longer automatic for offenders. And dorm residents can get and use keys to lock their rooms if they wish.
- Students have asked for and gotten representation on committees in nearly every facet of college life, from the various academic departments to faculty affairs. And they're asking for a hand in the administration, too.

The general campus reaction to all these changes is voiced by Mr. Van Sant: "By and large, they've taken the

responsibilities very well." And it's echoed by the students themselves: "We've proved over and over that we can handle the responsibility. Everyone thought the campus would crumble when we dropped the dress code. They *knew* it would when the drinking change went through. But it's still standing. . . ."

It's obvious from these changes in the way of life at MWC that a different kind of girl is defining what that life should be. The " 'teachable,' docile, unquestioning college women of the past" have indeed all but vanished. What about the "critical, aggressive, innovative" woman who's pretty well taken her place?

To begin with, she's brighter . . . at least, the statistics say she is. Seventy-six percent of last fall's freshmen came from the top 20 percent of their high school classes. Only 42½ percent did in 1955.

Director of Admissions Ray Merchent confirms that flatly: "We're getting a better segment of students . . . they have more information than you did 10 years ago. It's the result of more communication, a more mobile population, a different kind of pre-college environment."

Teacher after teacher agreed.

Mr. Van Sant remembered getting "unreadable" papers from our generation. Today he says they're "rare."

And new Dean Jim Croushore looked me in the collective eye and said, "Today's student knows a heck of a lot more than you did . . . I can't use the same class preparation on her."

The students themselves are very aware of this. "We have a broader concept of what education is all about," said one of my "radicals."

It's this kind of self-assurance that leads them to demand a hand in the internal affairs of the college, to speak out more freely in class and to "test the limits everywhere," as Mr. Thomas says.

Perhaps this is also what's led to a disdain for authority, to Anti-Establishment thinking, at least before their peers. Dean Whidden, who seemed to me more than a little discouraged by it all, said, "In private, most of the students are very agreeable; in public, they quarrel with you. The Dean, President, Chancellor can never be right, no matter what happens."

All this Anti-thinking, plus a highly developed social conscience (whether it's genuine or assimilated) tends to create the impression that today's student is not happy. Certainly, she's not carefree in the traditional college student sense.

Chancellor Simpson observes, "They don't laugh anymore, not the way you did."

Mr. Van Sant says that "as a group, they're less polite, rude in ways no one in your day would have been."

Dean Croushore concedes that he's had "to grow a thicker skin," since he moved into the administration, while Mr. Thomas attributes their somberness to that search for relevancy: "They stay away from cultural affairs because they think Beethoven and Brahms are luxuries when we are surrounded by pressing social problems."

I asked the girls themselves if they are having "fun" at college. There was a thoughtful silence and one answered seriously, "We have a different connotation of 'fun.' It's not 'rah-rah Mary Washington.' "

It's not drugs and revolutionary sex, either, I don't believe—at least not for the majority. Everyone with whom I talked agreed that there was some activity in both areas, but not enough to make headlines in my report. Over and over, I was told those matters fall into the category of "that's her business."

So I ceased trying to make it mine and turned instead to singling out the things that have survived the Ten Tumultuous Years relatively unchanged. There are a few. Girls still date the Marines at Quantico ("But not the career type"). They still decorate the dorms for Christmas, have fire drills and observe Devil-Goat rivalry. And they still sing "Standing in the Doorway," although I'm told they get a chuckle out of the lyrics.

I can hear Bob Dylan's lyrics coming up again in the background. By now, I'm listening with a new ear, an admittedly sympathetic ear. "The times they *are* a-changin' " and the complexion of Mary Washington College has changed right along with them. No more, no less than the needs of the world around her require.

We might be appalled by the ways in which the young go about meeting those needs—when you are "silent" anything sounds too loud. And the girls themselves say their generation never really meant to make so much noise. Susan Wagner, former Bullet editor whose controversial issues made headlines in the national press, explained quietly:

"In the beginning, we weren't out to *fight* City Hall, to fight people. Our idea was to go out and improve the society because we could, we had the time, we had the energy, we had the idealism.

"Then we found out it had to be a big fight, that people simply did not want to change."

I'm not condemning my generation —or former generations—if we saw nothing to change . . . except ourselves, so we could fit more comfortably into the molds society had made for us. After all, as Frank Conroy points out in *Esquire:*

"We became teenagers when to be a teenager was nothing. . . . Our clothing, manners and life-styles were unoriginal—scaled-down versions of what we saw in the adults. We had no sense of group identity, perhaps not much less than the teenage generations that had preceded us, but unquestionably less than the generation that was to follow 10 years later."

We were too busy seeking our place in the outside world to take a hard look at that world. We were busy being good students so we could go out and get the best that world had to offer, without being aware of the worst.

Perhaps *now,* 10 years after MWC, the time has come to condemn us, exactly because we have reached our goal. We have gone out and become part of the very world this generation is so desperate to change.

# INTO THE 70's
## a climate for change

by Donald Glover

Curricular changes may seem sudden and drastic departures from "the way things used to be," but really they come about slowly and involve a great amount of study and serious consideration before they become a fact at the College. Here at Mary Washington, as early as the mid-1960's, there was an increasingly urgent sense that many aspects of the degree program and its requirements, the calendar, student loads, and methods of instruction needed to be studied and evaluated. Two *ad hoc* Committees, on the Freshman Year and the Senior Year, recommended that degree requirements be brought in line with the higher achievement of our entering students and with current educational practices. In September of 1967, the Chancellor appointed a ten member *ad hoc* Committee on the Future of the College, and its purpose was primarily to recommend changes which might be necessary as the College continued its evolution as a liberal arts institution. During this two year study, many faculty committees (e.g. Academic Excellence, Curriculum, Instruction) were also investigating areas where change seemed imperative. The Student Government Association compiled a comprehensive report with recommendations on curricular changes, course load, and related matters. But a comprehensive study was beyond the scope of these various groups.

In 1969, the Future of the College Committee recommended that "a detailed and comprehensive curricular review be undertaken. . . ," and in the May, 1969 Faculty Meeting the Chancellor, noting that much had been discussed but little accomplished, reiterated his feeling that the continued growth and development of the College was directly related to our ability as a college community to determine our goals and move toward them. As the last act of business of this final meeting of the 1968-1969 session, the first concrete steps were taken to provide the necessary study by the creation of another *ad hoc* Committee composed of two members of the administration (Chancellor Simpson, Associate Dean Croushore); fifteen members of the faculty (Margery Arnold, Samuel Bird, Burton Cooper, Lewis Fickett, Donald Glover, Pauline King, Neal Klenke, Laura Sumner, Robert Shaw, Charles Sletten, Mary Ellen Stephenson, Glen Thomas, Thomas Turgeon, George Van Sant, and Lawrence Wishner); and three students (Anne Greever, Mary Lee Hearne, and Marilyn Preble). The group was officially called the "ad hoc Committee on Degree Requirements, Reform of the College Calendar, Student Loads and Methods of Instruction," but it became affectionately shortened to "that Committee" or "the one on nearly everything."

Everything certainly did come into the Committee discussions before the 1969-1970 session was out. The group, however, had been selected so that nearly all areas of the College could be represented. Seven members are departmental chairmen; the sciences and humanities are equally repre-

*"A measure of the success of All College Day is the enthusiasm we all felt then and continue to feel . . ."*

sented; both experienced and newer members of the faculty participated; and the student representatives had served in key student government offices and in student affairs.

During the summer of 1969, a Steering Committee, chaired by Dean Croushore, met ten times and hammered out an agenda for the full Committee to use in the fall. All members were asked to list those issues which they felt should form part of the Committee's discussions. An important feature of the completed agenda was that it included all the present features of the curriculum and then proposed options so that in studying the issues, a clear comparison and contrast could be made.

When the twenty member Committee met in the fall, full of enthusiasm but somewhat awed by the mammoth task ahead, we accepted the agenda, recognized the extremely tight time schedule (a report was due in the Chancellor's hands in March, 1970), and divided into subcommittees. George Van Sant very ably served throughout as the Chairman.

As the small subcommittees began meeting weekly, and frequently more often, we realized that the challenges were even greater than we had anticipated. The present degree requirements, student load, and methods of instruction and grading, and later the calendar were studied and evaluated. It was clear that all these issues were interrelated, and sometimes decisions

on one aspect hinged on settling others; thus, there were frequent roadblocks to surmount. Alternate programs were investigated in detail; other colleges were questioned on the success of their programs; a student poll was conducted on some of the issues under study.

After the full committee had met again several times throughout the late fall, we all realized that our progress was being slowed by our own lack of agreement on what principles should govern change at the College. So, over the Christmas vacation each member was asked to answer two questions: "What is really wrong with the present system?" and "What principles should we follow in recommending any changes?" The answers to these questions were essential to our progress.

Generally we agreed that the present system was good but needed revision in view of the increasing numbers of highly motivated and well-prepared students and the standards and high calibre of the faculty. We felt that no single course or series of courses should constitute a liberal arts program. Further, flexibility emerged by common agreement as one of the most necessary features in a new program for teaching and learning, a feature many felt was lacking in our present system. Flexibility and change were not, however, to be sought at the expense of the standards and quality of education which we had enjoyed. The two basic principles which appeared in our list of guidelines to change were again flexibility and quality. You might say that we knew Mary Washington was good, but we wanted to work in creative ways to make it even better. We all felt the need to justify any changes we might recommend and to see that these changes were feasible for this College.

With our major objectives more clearly defined and agreed upon, the

subcommittees reporting on their conclusions, and a general consensus developing in meetings throughout January and February, the outline of a new and exciting curriculum began to emerge. The pieces began to fall into place.

We had been, throughout the year, in close contact with the college community by reporting our actions and progress in a series of bulletins. We all talked to colleagues, students, members of the administration, alumnae, and colleagues at other colleges. We were receiving some "feedback," but it became clear that major changes such as these needed thorough and full discussion by everyone concerned. Thus, when our thirty page initial report was accepted in mid-March by Chancellor Simpson, plans were already underway to have a unique all-College Day discussion of these changes. Dean James Croushore originally suggested the idea, and it was his penance to have to mastermind the project and carry it through to a successful conclusion.

College classes were suspended on Wednesday, April 29th, and students, faculty, and administration, provided with a brief but thorough outline of our proposals, met in a group filling George Washington Hall. In forty discussion groups, including some thirty students and five faculty members each, the issues were hashed over, new views were offered, steam was blown off, gripes were given, creative plans suggested which we had never considered, and straw votes taken on all proposals. After two one hour and a half sessions, the group leaders reported to the whole group. A measure of the success of this day is the enthusiasm we all felt then and continue to feel and the mutual concern of all the college community that we make liberal arts education at Mary Washington the best available. There was neither student nor faculty apathy.

The informal voting indicated majority support for all the proposals except one changing the grading system. On the strength of that disapproval, the Committee is reconsidering a new recommendation. Within weeks, the faculty voted into the College curriculum four recommenda-

*"...in a time when college communities have not been peaceful . . . Mary Washington has been able to carry through a vital academic task of self-examination..."*

tions covering basic requirements and major programs, and new routes toward the major. We were at the end of a long, rigorous study but at the beginning of a new and creative era at Mary Washington.

Here are the changes you can expect to see in the curriculum, probably in 1971, with a brief explanation of what they mean.

*Basic requirements:*

Two courses are required in *each* of these areas:

a. *Literature:* including English, Modern Foreign Language, and Classics.

b. *Humanities:* including Art, Dance, Dramatic Arts, Music, Philosophy, and Religion.

c. *Social Sciences:* including Economics, History, Geography, Political Science, Psychology, and Sociology.

d. *Natural Sciences and Mathematics:* including Biology, Chemistry, Geology, Mathematics, and Physics.

The College now requires 40 courses for graduation. The new plan, depending on our later selection of an appropriate calendar, will require 36 or 32 courses. The reasons for the reduction in total courses required and in the basic requirements are that students and faculty are unproductively overburdened; the students come better prepared to work intensely and in depth on fewer courses; and students and faculty need greater time and freedom for independent study on all levels.

The student will now have 12 courses of "Diversification" (what we formerly called Electives and Related Fields), no more than 12 courses in the major program, and four courses labeled "Electives," so that a student may choose to take a few more courses in her major subject if she wishes. These more evenly balanced

requirements total 36 courses with an additional one year of Physical Education required and the freedom to take up to six more courses in that subject for credit. A student will also be required upon entrance to show competence in English Composition or attend a non-credit writing clinic, and competence in a foreign language at the intermediate college level. All these changes recognize the student's greater ability, preparation, and desire for choice, as well as the professor's desire to stimulate and challenge the student and respond to her need and make her choices meaningful.

Three other proposals allow alternatives to this basic plan for students who are especially qualified. One allows greater concentration in the major subject—up to half the total courses—if the program is approved by the adviser and a faculty committee. Another proposal provides opportunity for special major programs—an innovative and flexible program where the student and adviser with a faculty committee's approval create a unique major. The last proposal sets up a committee to study the possibility of developing "general education" courses as alternatives to fill the basic requirements mentioned above.

As the College session drew to a close, there was much to look forward to in bringing these ideas into the life of the College. Much remains to be done. Decisions on what calendar and grading systems to use remain. We must decide on the effective date for beginning the changes and whom they will effect. We all agree, however, that in a time when college communities have not been peaceful and people have been impatient and unwilling to listen, Mary Washington has been able to carry through a vital academic task of self-examination and self-evaluation involving the best and most sincere efforts of everyone connected with the College and producing what can only be a stronger and richer liberal arts center of learning. And that, after all, is what we are here for.


**THE AUTHOR**

*Donald E. Glover, Associate Professor and Chairman of the Department of English, has been a member of the Mary Washington College faculty since 1961. He is a member of the ad hoc Committee on Degree Requirements, the Calendar Year and the Student Course Load and served as secretary of the committee during the past year.*

# SPOTSWOOD SPOTLIGHT

## MARRIAGES

'49 **Jackie McConnell** Berry to Leslie Carlton Scarborough, Jr.

'56 **Mary Linda Fitchett** Addison to William David Elliott, November 15, 1969.

**Mary Gale Buchanan** to Parker Matthai, June 6, 1970.

'62 **Linda Barwick** to Thomas Jurcich, April 4, 1970 in Alexandria, Va.

'63 **Virginia (Ginny) Byles** to Richard N. Foreman, Captain, U.S.A., April 17, 1970.

'65 **Barbara Hill** to Thomas W. Rapplean, February 28, 1970. They are living in Hazelwood, Mo.

'66 **Mary Ellen (Sue) Harmon** to William B. Litton, February 7, 1970.

'67 **Polly Brill** to L. Bruce Hogshead, May 16, 1970. They are residing in Pearisburg, Va.

'68 **Trina Mazaitis** to Rodney L. Campbell, Lieutenant, U.S.M.C., July 12, 1969 at Fort Eustis.

'69 **Kay Barnes** to Donnie Goldberg in August 1969. They live in Portsmouth, Va.

**Ruth Ann Sichol** to Kenneth Edward Myers, May 2, 1970 in Atlanta, where they now reside.

**Patricia Thomas** to Jerry Marcus, December 19, 1969. They are in Germany.

**Patricia Weller** to Jimmy Wigginton, December 6, 1969. They are residing in Maryland.

**Dale Winn** to David Murray in September 1969. They are residing in Texas.

## BIRTHS

'54 Born to Robert and **Jean Rowell** Callahan, fourth child, third son, Charles Patrick, December 5, 1968.

'56 Born to John and **Jackie Wilkins** Upp, a first child, boy, John Wilkins, February 11, 1970.

'58 Born to Charles Rodney and **Jean Lee Anderson** Chapman, third daughter, Mary Anderson, February 20, 1970.

Born to George William and **Anne Belt** Norris, a son, George William, Jr., April 20, 1970.

'59 Born to Martin and **Shelly Cohen** Mand, second child, second son, Michael Evan, April 14, 1970 in Wilmington, Delaware.

'61 Born to Singh and **Carolyn Crum** Pannu, second child, first son, Raj Singh, March 18, 1970 in Evanston, Illinois.

Born to William Thomas and **Mary Richardson** Quigley, third child, William Scott, July 28, 1969.

'63 Born to Donald and **Sandra Stallard** Earls, first child, a daughter, Shawn, June 20, 1969.

Born to Joe and **Mary Lamb Bond** Lucas, twin girls, Carter and Dana, December, 1969.

Born to Francis and **Judith Roberson** Previte, a son, Paul Andrew, November 16, 1969 in Vienna, Va.

'64 Born to Chip and **Clara Forlines** Conver, twin sons Timothy Forlines and Mark Franklin, March 23, 1970 in Charlottesville.

Born to Robert and **Anne Liady** Lynch, a daughter, Elizabeth Vernon, April 13, 1970.

Born to Andrew and **Elizabeth Felton** Puckett, second daughter, Emily Anne, January 12, 1970 in Chilhowie.

Born to John and **Ruth Pharr** Sayer, a daughter, Lorena Hope, February 14, 1970 in Newport, R. I.

Born to Eddie and **Judy Simpson** Witt, twins, Teresa Marie and Natalie Jean, March 17, 1970.

Born to Peter and **Marilyn Horvath** Wriede, a daughter, Stephanie Lynn, February 18, 1970.

'65 Born to John and **Penny Partridge** Booth, a daughter, Elizabeth Ashley ("Lisa"), April 29, 1970.

Born to Harry and **Bobby Barrett** Crisp, a son, Harry Edward Crisp III, July 28, 1969.

Born to Ronald and **Pat Sprenkle** Davis, twins, Tasha Lynne and Ronald Lee Davis, Jr., February 3, 1970.

Born to Tim and **Martha Hancock** Fuller, a son, Travis, August 18, 1969.

Born to Barrie and **Barbara Sweeney** Gillis, a daughter, Bridget Kathleen, September 30, 1969.

Born to Mark and **Jo Love Morgan** Willis, a daughter, Sara Cory, April 15, 1970.

'66 Born to Samuel and **Barbara Leigh Sweeney** Baker, first child, a son, Samuel Marvey Baker III, May 6, 1970.

Born to James and **Jan Gourley** Gates, a son, James, March 23, 1970.

Born to Dan and **Nancy Alford** Hernandez, first child, Andrew Daniel, April 20, 1970.

Born to Gary and **Ambler Carter** Kamp, first child, John Reed, April 15, 1970.

Born to Stephen and **Ann Kales** Lindbloom, a girl, Ann Elizabeth, February 14, 1970.

Born to Paul and **Donna Davis** Monday, a son, June 2, 1970.

Born to Clay and **Evie Tune** Shelton, second daughter, Dale Kristine, May 12, 1970.

Born to Steve and **Judy Blum**

Wasserman, second daughter, Gail Ellen, April 6, 1970.

'67 Born to John and **Fonda Davis** Eyler, first child, a daughter, Lisa Todd, February 13, 1970.

## DEATHS

The members of the Alumnae Association express their sorrow to the family of **Kitty Turner** Saunders '37, who passed away on April 29, 1970; to Dr. Alwyn Hundley, whose sister, **Mae Hundley** Wood '16, died recently; to **Mildred Crawford** Lee '28, whose sister, **Wilda Crawford** Prevost '29, died January 14, 1970; to the family of **Christine Louise Pillow** '65, who passed away on April 3, 1970; to **Judy Roberson** Previte '63 whose father passed away last August; to **Helen Downer** Hale '39, **Jane Hale** '64, and their family on the death of Thomas Neill Hale in March; to **Mary Helsabeck** Townsend '39, whose father, Edger N. Helsabeck, died in March; to **Ethel Nelson** Wetmore '36, and her family on the death of her father on March 15, 1970.

## CHAPTER NOTES

The successful money-making activity of the Baltimore Chapter is its rummage sale at the Cross Street market. Members donate old clothing or household articles which are sold at reasonable prices. The remaining things are donated to the Volunteers of America.

The next meeting of the Chicago Area Chapter will be held on Thursday, October 8, 1970 at 7:30 p.m. at the home of Mrs. Robert C. Warren (**Mary Cottingham** '50), 126 Old Oak Road, North Barrington, Illinois 60010. Interested persons are asked to contact Mrs. Warren or Mrs. J. Singh Pannu (**Carolyn Crum** '61), 156 Central Street, Evanston, Illinois 60201.

The Delaware Club held a successful covered dish supper for alumnae and husbands on February 27, 1970 at the home of **Charlotte Baylis** Koffenberger '49. On Saturday, April 26 a garage sale was held at the home of **Janet Spang** Hess '60 in order to raise money for the club's activities. The annual joint luncheon with the Philadelphia Club was held on Saturday, May 16 in Media, Pa. Miss Mary Ellen Stephenson, Chairman of the Department of Modern Foreign Languages and former Assistant Dean of Students, spoke about her experiences of teaching in India.

A new money-making activity tried by the Fredericksburg Chapter was a "stay-at-home night" benefit. Tickets were sold. Members of the chapter donated prizes of homemade goodies and needlecraft to be presented to the lucky ticket-holders who were home when they were called by telephone.

The only money-making project of the Norfolk Chapter is a "pecan sell." Each year the chapter orders shelled, whole pecans to be sold before Thanksgiving and Christmas. The May program for this group was a catered Japanese luncheon which featured Mrs. John P. Garrett's talk on Japan.

The Raleigh Chapter had a dinner for members and ther husbands at the Plantation Inn on April 8, 1970. Miss Ann Perinchief, Director of Alumnae Affairs, was the speaker.

An appeal for membership in the Richmond Chapter was made through a letter from the local president. As a result the group received evidence of new and continuing interest from area residents. A luncheon meeting was held on May 23, 1970, when Mrs. Laura V. Sumner, Director of the Summer Session and Chairman of the Classics Department, spoke about the College. The Richmond Chapter also noted that its "back yard sale" was a successful fund-raising venture.

The Southern California Chapter reports that it has a mailing list of 106 persons. Attendance at meetings during the past year has been good.

## GIFTS

Contributions to the Alumnae Fund for the 1970 fiscal year, which ended June 30, totaled more than $28,000, about a forty percent increase over the amount collected the preceding year.

There were some 1,954 gifts, nearly 200 more than the number of contributions in 1969. Of the total, some $25,384 was received as unrestricted donations and another $1,969 was donated as restricted.

There was also a sharp increase in the number of $100 givers, with forty-four this year compared to eleven a year ago. In addition, there was $1,945 in business donations from some eighteen business and professional men in the Fredericksburg area.

The contribution list also included gifts from thirteen faculty members, forty-five parents, and there were eight $500 givers.

### Braille Transcription Course Offered Again

Instruction in braille transcription will be offered again this year at Mary Washington College. The course, which is designed to train certified braillists for the production of materials for the blind, is a continuing project of members of the college community and area residents.

Interested persons should attend the organizational meeting in Combs Science Hall, Room 100, at 2:00 p.m. on Wednesday, September 30, 1970. The exact day and time of the course will be determined at that meeting. For additional information prior to that time, one may contact Mrs. John C. Russell, 1308 Brent Street, Fredericksburg, Virginia 22401.

Mrs. Russell has emphasized that the braille writers for the course are being purchased with gifts of Top Value and S&H trading stamps. Persons wishing to donate stamps are requested to send or deliver them to the MWC Alumnae Association, Spotswood Alumnae House, College Avenue, Fredericksburg (mailing address: Box 1315 College Station, Fredericksburg, Virginia 22401).

**MARY WASHINGTON COLLEGE**
**of the University of Virginia**
Box 1315 College Station
Fredericksburg, Virginia 22401

Second Class Postage Paid at Fredericksburg, Va.